

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/552,572	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SPEITH-HERFURTH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Monique R. Jackson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Allowed

 (1) Monique R. Jackson.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Ashley Pezzner.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 21 October 2009
**Time:** 11:30am
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Pending 103 rejections*

Claims discussed:

*All pending*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Murschall et al, Speith-Herfurth, Cretekos*
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*A discussion took place with regards to the Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/09 in terms of the difference in cold-sealability of the instant film over the films of the prior art. The Applicant's attorney agreed to an Examiner's Amendment incorporating the term "cold-sealable" into claim 1 to clarify that the film comprising te cold sealing adhesive coating on its outer surface is cold sealable.*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Monique R Jackson/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)